

Martin, Molly

From: Karina Johnston <kjohnston@santamonicabay.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 3:12 PM
To: Martin, Molly
Cc: Scott Valor; Tom Ford; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards (Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov); Mcshane, John
Subject: RE: Ballona Stakeholders and Roles
Attachments: Johnston_BWER general presentation_03-19-14_sm.pdf

Hi Molly et al –

I've responded to each of your clarification points below in **green**, and have also attached a presentation for your reference. It is a general outreach presentation that has some good informational slides, including some on the CEQA process, BWER history, summary scientific results, and others. I think you'll enjoy it – I hope it's also a helpful reference for you and may serve to answer additional questions, but please contact me before sharing it / posting it publicly. I'd be happy to give you the full talk that goes along with it sometime via webinar if you are interested?

As always, please feel free to email me with any additional specific questions or comments – especially if you need scientific facts or anything about the history of the site or process. We very much want to continue this open line of communication.

Hugs to Luke! :)
-Karina

- 1) CA Fish & Wildlife role: operates reserve, project lead, decision maker

KJ: Correct; the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) are the land managers for the reserve as well as the project proponents and lead through CEQA. The Army Corps is the project lead for NEPA (federal) as several of the alternatives may impact existing flood control structures. The project will include both an EIR (CEQA) and an EIS (NEPA). LA County Flood Control District is another active partner. State Lands Commission (SLC) manages a small area of the site as well (less than 10%) and is another project partner. The State of California actually owns the land.

- 2) Coastal Commission role: funded first portion of CEQA; no longer funds because? other and current roles in process?

KJ: Not correct. The California State Coastal **Conservancy** (SCC) has funded many aspects of this project, including years of scientific baseline surveys, the historical ecology report, a water budget analysis, geotechnical and hydrological surveys, and many other scientific analyses (public documents & products are available for free download on the project website: www.ballonarestoration.org). SCC continues to fund the both EIR & EIS process and participates as a project partner. The primary consulting company drafting those documents is ICF, although there are many subcontracts.

The Coastal **Commission** will also have to eventually approve the project chosen by DFW, as is it in the Coastal Zone.

- 3) Annenberg role: now funds CEQA and funding goes through the foundation to the consultant _____ whom is responsible for EIR preparation,

KJ: Not correct. DFW and SCC are coordinating EIR preparation. A private entity would not be funding the CEQA process. However, Annenberg, as a private entity with an interest in the project, may be funding its own efforts in collaboration with the lead agencies.

- 4) NEP role: collection of ecological data (past _ years), Serves on technical team _____ name _____, administer funds for project management - including passing funds from Annenberg to consultant _____ that is writing CEQA and any other aspects of project management?

KJ: TBF's role, beginning in the mid-2000's, has been to facilitate the on-the-ground, local efforts for outreach and scientific data collection for the project. Until recently, DFW did not have a land manager specific to the Ballona Reserve, and needed a local representative to help them manage the process. TBF participated in the original stakeholder process (see attached presentation) and began comprehensive scientific surveys of the site in 2009 (continuing in various ways through present day – see Baseline Reports, attachment, etc). Many, many professional scientists have been involved over the years, but TBF has led these efforts (again, loads of details in the Baseline Reports, the Science Advisory Committee Memo & notes, and the new Habitat Memo – all available on the website). Various staff of TBF have served on the technical team for the EIR process for many years and TBF continues to participate as part of the diverse Project Management Team. Again, ICF is the consulting company drafting the CEQA/NEPA documents with direct oversight from DFW and the Project Management Team.

- 5) Summary of Annenberg agreement relevant top funding- is this what sets up the agreement for funds for the EIR/EIS to go from Annenberg through TBF to consulting firm x? Also please re-visit why or how that arrangement is set up

KJ: Questions regarding Annenberg's private consulting agreements should be addressed to them and/or the lead agencies. Again, SCC is funding the EIR/EIS process. Additional details in answer #2.

- 6) Additional info:

At no point have EPA Section 320 funds been used to promote a dog and cat adoption facility. Neither TBF nor the SMBRC have an official stance on any of the alternatives until the EIR is complete and all of the scientific data have been analyzed. It is premature to assume anything about our position, except that as an NEP, we (of course) promote habitat and wetland restoration to increase the health of degraded ecosystems. Funds to conduct the science and to outreach about the site in general have been provided to TBF primarily through several grants from SCC. The website is managed jointly by DFW, SCC, SMBRC, and the Annenbergs, as clearly outlined by the logos at the bottom of every page.

Many additional answers to questions can be found by folks directly visiting the website: www.ballonarestoration.org. The project partners have made a significant effort to post as much information as possible on there (in as clear a format as possible) for people to peruse at their leisure (including descriptions of the potential alternatives, even though they are still subject to revision). It is much more information than any normal CEQA process would give, including a full history of the BWER and current data and reports, and it just exemplifies how much this project and the partners have consistently gone above and beyond to be a transparent process. We would love additional feedback on this site from the EPA, if you have a chance to look over it – we'd be happy to pass it along to the project partners.

Karina Johnston
Director of Watershed Programs
*Office: (310) 216-9824 *** new number*

From: Karina Johnston
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 11:01 AM
To: 'Martin, Molly'
Cc: Scott Valor; Tom Ford; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards (Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov); Mcshane, John
Subject: RE: Ballona Stakeholders and Roles

Definitely, Molly! I'll get on this right now. Thanks for the response – at least it's working again to you guys.

Unfortunately, we don't have proposed restoration numbers because there is not a project yet. As soon as DFW picks one, then we'll know what the proposed acreages could be. That's really an important point to make to the public, is that no matter how many people tell you otherwise, DFW has NOT chosen a preferred project until all of the science is in and they can see all of the analyses in the EIR. There aren't even final habitat acreages assigned for each alternative yet. But there is plenty of other info I can provide! I'll also try to send a good outreach presentation to you so you can refer to that as needed.

I'll cc Scott, Tom, and Guangyu as well so they can stay in the loop.

Karina Johnston
Director of Watershed Programs
*Office: (310) 216-9824 *** new number*

From: Martin, Molly [<mailto:Martin.Molly@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 10:51 AM
To: Karina Johnston
Cc: Scott Valor
Subject: RE: Ballona Stakeholders and Roles

Yes Karina,

I received this email. So frustrating when technology is not working! Thanks for flagging your new number in your signature block – I will update my records.

If you can get to this today that is great. I also have another request for information related to Ballona. I spoke to Scott yesterday about this and I would also like a brief description that we also discussed at the PE regarding the issues of the range and amount of habitat types proposed in the restoration (i.e. freshwater vs saltwater marsh)
I know that is a tall order to ask all the years of research and science to be boiled down, but Scott said maybe he could help with this too.

I am fully confident in the science you and your partners are carrying out, I am just not as familiar with the specifics and want to have a paragraph or two so that I can better understand the specifics and be able to refer to it in case there are specific questions in the future directed towards my office.

Thanks!

Molly Martin

Coastal Watershed Coordinator
U.S. EPA, Region 9



United States Environmental Protection Agency

75 Hawthorne Street,
San Francisco, CA 94105
tel: (415) 972-3403
fax: (415) 947-3537
E-mail: Martin.Molly@epa.gov

From: Karina Johnston [<mailto:kjohnston@santamonicabay.org>]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2014 10:40 AM

To: Martin, Molly
Cc: Mcshane, John
Subject: RE: Ballona Stakeholders and Roles

Hi Molly & John –

I'm so sorry I haven't had the chance to get back to you regarding the information below. Our email has actually been down since Friday (should be ok now... but if you could let me know you get this, that would be great).

Several of them are right on target, and a few are not accurate. I'll edit them and draft up a few additional points for you by this afternoon.

Karina Johnston
Director of Watershed Programs
*Office: (310) 216-9824 *** new number*

From: Martin, Molly [<mailto:Martin.Molly@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 5:14 PM
To: Karina Johnston
Cc: Mcshane, John
Subject: Ballona Stakeholders and Roles

Hi Karina,

Just wanted you to put in writing some of the points we discussed about Ballona at the PE on Tuesday morning to clarify our knowledge so we can be accurately responsive to requests in the future.

Please just provide basic bullets of the various stakeholders and their role in the process. I have some notes/bullets here below to start with that you may need to correct/clarify and please expand on these as needed to give us pertinent information

CA Fish & Wildlife role: operates reserve, project lead, decision maker

Coastal Commission role: funded first portion of CEQA; no longer funds because? other and current roles in process?

Annenberg role: now funds CEQA and funding goes through the foundation to the consultant _____ whom is responsible for EIR preparation,

NEP role: collection of ecological data (past _ years), Serves on technical team _____name_____, administer funds for project management - including passing funds from Annenberg to consultant _____ that is writing CEQA and any other aspects of project management?

Summary of Annenberg agreement relevant top funding- is this what sets up the agreement for funds for the EIR/EIS to go from Annenberg through TBF to consulting firm x?
Also please re-visit why or how that arrangement is set up

Thanks

Molly Martin
Coastal Watershed Coordinator

U.S. EPA, Region 9



United States Environmental Protection Agency

75 Hawthorne Street,
San Francisco, CA 94105
tel: (415) 972-3403
fax: (415) 947-3537
E-mail: Martin.Molly@epa.gov